

ITJSG Minutes

January 31,2000

Attendance: Mike Williams (ITJSG Chairman), Andy Blaher (DCMC-ABA), Rowe Campbell (DCMC-BA), , Dave Hoshaw (DCMDI), Bob Kennedy (DCMC-OB), Aristides Maldonado (DCMC-O), Mark Melnyk (DCMC-OB), COL Thomas Sutliff (DCMDW, via Teleconference), John Zorich (DCMC-ABA Team Chief) and Tory Baggiano (Analyst).

Agenda (*Briefings attached*):

- 1) **Supplier Information Service (SIS) Version 3.0 and Risk Assessment Management Program (RAMP), Milestone II-R (Rebaseline) Approval Request-** Bob Kennedy, Functional Sponsor substituting for Jim Rardon, Program Manager
- 2) **SIS Version 4.0/RAMP, Milestone 0 (Concept Development) Approval Request-** Bob Kennedy, Functional Sponsor
- 3) **MOCAS, Milestone 00 (Mission Need) Approval Request-** Mark Melnyk
- 4) **Contract Administration Service (CAS) Component Directory, Milestone 0 (Concept Exploration) Approval Request-** Andy Blaher

Minutes (*Action Items and Decisions in blue italics*):

SIS Version 3.0/ RAMP, Milestone II-R (Rebaseline) Approval Request- Bob Kennedy, Functional Sponsor

Overview

- Bob Kennedy, Functional Sponsor, covered his portion of the briefing as well as that of Jim Rardon, Program Manager, who was TDY for SIS Version 3.0 Testing.
- Bob presented SIS/RAMP Version 3.0 Milestone IIR (Rebaselining) charts.
- Bob reviewed the SIS Version 3.0/RAMP Mission Needs Statement, SIS's relationship to the DCMC Business Plan relationship, and the System Architecture (slides 1-6).
- Per Mike, change the "NT" abbreviation on the System Architecture slide to the word "Netscape" regarding the Carson server, so as to not confuse people with the NT Operating System.

Status

- Bob stated the "good news" (slide 7)--the team not only developed and tested CSS and SAMS in 11 months and developed RAMP in 9 months, but SAMS should provide an opportunity to automate the password request process for most if not all DCMC applications.
- Mike agreed that the SAMS solution might become standard across all Command applications.
- Bob stated that SIS/RAMP is within budget given the original requirements; however, the team recognized new opportunities for improving the SIS/RAMP system or satisfying DCMC standard technical architecture requirements (slide 8-Netscape Enterprise Webserver, Secure Socket Layer, Oracle 8, Security Issues).

Re-baseline Request

- Per Slide 8, Bob and Jim requested an additional \$285K for SIS/RAMP FY00 funding consisting of:
 - \$150K for SIS/RAMP testing, training and installation
 - \$135K for SIS Version 2.0/3.0 Maintenance (SIS maintenance \$ had been overlooked in previous program planning)

- Per Mike the \$285k is not currently available; however funding may become available after this week's budget execution review.
- Mike stated that if funding does not become available, a business case will have to be developed and sent through the Business Planning Team (BPT) and the Resource Utilization Council (RUC).
- Mike asked Rowe if this was a possibility.
- Per Rowe, if the funding is available, there should not be a problem.
- Per Bob, on February 4 the contractor (Synergy) will run out of funding.
- Per Mike, the contractor may have a work delay period, or plans may be made to continue contractor work with a short term funding arrangement until the business case is approved by the RUC.

Decision

- *The ITJSG approved the action to approve the SIS Version 3.0/RAMP Milestone II-R Request.*

SIS Version 4.0/ RAMP, Milestone 0 (Concept Exploration) Approval Request- Bob Kennedy

Overview

- Bob Kennedy, Functional Sponsor, presented/briefed to the group the SIS/RAMP v 4.0 Milestone 0 charts.
- Bob reviewed the ITJSG's December 16th instruction to proceed with SIS/RAMP Concept Exploration.
- Per Bob, as a result of the SIS team's detailed design review in Columbus, the field identified some new, viable system requirements.

New features

- Slides 3-6 explored alternatives to address the SIS v 4.0 requirements.
- Per Bob, Slide 7, shows the recommended course of action--to make major modifications to SIS by enhancing the RAMP and PASS components--and rationale.
- Mike asked what the key benefits of Version 4.0 are.
- Per Bob, to develop one database for users to easily access survey and audit records.
- Mike referenced the seamless integration bullet in slide 7, and asked Bob to explain.
- Per Bob, the integration will enable SIS to have the capability to sort multiple cage codes to compute program ratings. It will also allow information stored in PASS to be pulled by DIRAMS, eliminating redundant data entry.
- COL Sutliff asked if SIS will have the new Risk Maturity Matrix Model capability.
- Per Bob/Mike, the Model is a checklist tool, SIS is a daily work tool.

Architecture

- Per Mike, in slide 8--Notional System Architecture--change the "NT" abbreviation to the word "Netscape" regarding the Carson Server, as to not confuse people with the NT Operating System.

Preliminary Estimates

- Per Slide 9, Bob estimated v 4.0 would cost between \$660-990K for a 12-18 month effort.
- Bob stated additional performance benefits, listed on slide 9.
- Rowe stated that an Economic Analysis (EA) will be needed to quantify projected benefits into dollars saved.
- Mike agreed.
- Bob stated that labor hour reductions due to streamlined processes could be quantified into dollars.
- *The ITJSG asked Bob to make reasonable projections and quantify into dollars the projected benefits of v 4.0.*
- Bob covered the anticipated risks and steps to mitigate in slide 10.

- Mike asked Bob to remove the “continued management support” bullet as this is always a concern with all programs.
- Per Bob, he and Jim Rardon have not yet coordinated v 4.0 plans with the TAWG or IDSG.
- Per Mike, coordination with the TAWG and IDSG is mandatory.

Decision

- *The ITJSG directed the SIS IPT to rework the SIS Version 4.0/RAMP Milestone 0 Approval briefing, specifically quantifying projected benefits in terms of dollars to show the group what the command will receive for the \$660-990K cost of the program, and present to the ITJSG.*
- *Focus on strong ROI and true risk mitigation strategy by showing the incremental \$ benefits from selected sets of functional requirements/product features versus those features’ costs. This way the command will be able to prioritize future spending based on the incremental functional requirements’ “Returns on Investment.”.*

MOCAS, Milestone 00 (Mission Need) Approval Request- Mark Melnyk

Overview

- Mark Melnyk presented/briefed to the group a MOCAS Milestone 00 (Mission Need) Approval, requesting that an additional field be added to the MOCAS system in order to more effectively measure contract delivery data.

Additional Schedule Field

- Per slide 3, Mark identified the need for a *date* field to be added at the delivery schedule level to identify the *acceptance* date of the stated quantity.
- Mike stated that the acceptance field was already present.
- Per Mark/Andy the acceptance *quantity* field is there, but not date.

Benefits

- Slide 3 also addressed the benefits of the new field (rapid access of historical schedule data and new PowerPlay cubes could be developed to quickly deliver data that is currently manually compiled).
- Andy reported that DITC has estimated that the cost to add the additional field would be about \$250k and take a year or so to fully test and implement.
- John stated that this is a considerable amount of money given the projected benefit (which will be of short duration because of MOCAS’s planned retirement) and suggested that the funding might be used more effectively for another mission need.
- Andy suggested another option might be to pull the data--which does exist in MOCAS today, but separate from the schedule records--from SDW via PowerPlay cubes. This would be potentially much less expensive.
- *Mike directed Mark to work with Andy to see if the SDW option was viable and explore other options.*

Decision

- *The ITJSG approved the action to approve the MOCAS Milestone 00 Mission Need as viable and to proceed to evaluate options; however rejected the proposed solution of adding a new field to MOCAS.*

Contract Administration Service (CAS) Component Directory, Milestone 0 (Concept Exploration) Approval Request- Andy Blaher

Overview

- Andy introduced/explained the CAS Components Directory Milestone 0 (Concept Exploration) Briefing Charts.

- The 10 charts covered CAS Components Directory Concept Exploration topics: *Alternatives Analysis- COTS*, *COTS w/ Minor vs. Major Modification*, and *New Start Options*, *Alternative Selected*, *Preliminary Cost/Schedule Estimates*, *Notional System Architecture*, *Risk Analysis*, and *Group Coordinations*.

Alternatives Analysis

- Per slide 2, no there is no COTS solution currently available.
- Per slides 3 and 4, several applications containing portions of the needed data could be modified (minor or major) to deliver the needed functionality. Those applications are Supplier Information Service (SIS) and Alerts. The main advantage of this approach would be relatively low development cost.
- Per Slide 5, explored a total new start with the advantage of total requirements being satisfied, but at higher cost with functionalities that overlap existing DCMC applications.

Recommendation

- Per Slide 6, Andy recommended modifying SIS to incorporate the CAS Component Directory. The primary reason for that recommendation is that SIS already incorporates many of the features of the CAS Components Directory as well as a Contract Administration Office location ability.

Architecture

- The group reviewed the notional architecture (slide 7), which is the current SIS architecture with the addition of a data feed from Alerts' Oracle database to SIS's Oracle database.

Preliminary Estimates

- Andy explained the projected benefits of the CAS Components Directory (avoiding the high cost of paper production and distribution, making the current electronic text documents much more user friendly, and enhancing customer support through the integration of DCMC Systems. See Slide 8).
- Mike noted that much greater detail of projected benefits, including a Return on Investment (ROI) analysis will be needed in the future.
- Andy stated that a preliminary ROI analysis has begun.
- The cost estimate was up to \$200k, but could be less.
- The schedule estimate is about one year.

Risk Analysis

- Chart 9 explained the anticipated risks (difficulty of system integration, impacts to the SIS development schedule, difficulty integrating non-DCMC data, and security) as well as risk mitigation steps (coordination of requirement between all affected programs, cost/schedule coordination between programs, and adequate ORD and FD to convey clear requirements to the developers).
- Mike reiterated (he earlier suggested this in a CAS Directory IPR) that detailed requirements generation should start by drawing a picture of what the CAS Components Directory data entry/display screens should look like (perhaps, via PowerPoint slides). Also, that process flow charts should be developed.

Group Coordination

- Per Slide 10, TAWG approval should not be an issue as the recommendation uses existing Command Architecture. And it is too early to develop a schedule for submission to the IDSG.
- *Per Mike TAWG and IDSG coordination is mandatory and directed Andy to coordinate CAS Directory plans with both groups.*

Decision

- *The ITJSG approved CAS Component Directory Milestone 0 (Concept Exploration) and proceed to Milestone 1- Approval (Begin a new Acquisition). The ITJSG instructed Andy to work with Jim Rardon (SIS PM) to further the requirements development of the CAS Directory. Jim will then become the PM for the CAS Components Directory as the system will be incorporated into SIS.*